

## Meeting Notes

**12 March 2008**

**Location:** Douglas Co. Land and Trans. Serv. Building, 140 19<sup>th</sup> St. NW, East Wen.

**For more info contact:** Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 baldwcmb@dfw.wa.gov

---

Attendance: Joe Kelly, Russell Langshaw, Tracy Hillman, Casey Baldwin, Tom Kahler, Jon Honea, Michelle McClure, Derek Van Marter, Chuck Peven, Kate Terrell, Cameron Thomas, Steve Hays, Ken Bevis, Julie Morgan, James White, Ron Walter, Steve Kolk, Carson Keeler.

1. Review and adopt the agenda:

Casey asked for introductions around the room. Ken Bevis introduced himself as the new WDFW Watershed Stewardship Biologist. No changes were suggested for the agenda.

2. Nason Creek Biological Benefit Prioritization (update)

Casey updated the group on this effort. After the last meeting Casey wrote up a draft document on the RTT approach and analysis of biological benefit and has circulated it to the subgroup. The subgroup will meet March 13 to go over the draft product. Once that is complete, Casey will circulate it to the RTT for further comment and finalization.

3. WDFW Pump Screen Project Prioritization Update

At the February 13<sup>th</sup> RTT meeting Casey had brought up a request from Cherylynn Tunnicliff (WDFW) who was seeking RTT input on prioritizing pump screening in the Upper Columbia. Casey updated the group on where this effort stands. He pointed out that the scope of the project was different from that presented to the RTT for comment, and that WDFW is including the Okanogan in the project. Casey said this change prompted him to remove the recommendation from the previous meeting's notes until he could confirm with the RTT how to proceed. Some of the members suggested inserting that section of the discussion back into the summary from the last meeting, since it was discussed at the last meeting, regardless of what had changed and why. Casey agreed and added that the February notes clearly specified that the RTT recommendation excluded the Okanogan, so there should not be confusion about which subbasins the RTT recommendation considered. Some RTT members suggested that even though the Okanogan was omitted from the previous discussion, it likely would not have changed the recommendation on where to start the pump-screening project. Casey suggested that since the RTT had not been asked for further review and input on the project that they should probably hold off.

4. Data Gap Prioritization

Casey handed out the criteria for prioritizing data gaps and mentioned that Keely had asked him to seek comments and approval on it. Keely did not receive any comments on

these criteria and the scoring associated with them since the last meeting. Casey was asking the RTT for one final review and confirmation. Tracy asked for an explanation of the criterion “scale of applicability.” The group discussed the feasibility of implementing this criterion. They concluded that many assessment actions would be applicable at multiple spatial scales, but that the criteria and scoring were still valid and remained unchanged.

The group also suggested ensuring that the notes and rating matrices are consistent. Michelle suggested revising the Abundance and Productivity criterion description to read: “Does the data gap or uncertainty decrease our ability to assess abundance or productivity?” Casey incorporated that suggestion in the table.

The members then reviewed the scoring of the data gaps that were initially completed by the Monitoring and Data Management Committee. The group particularly focused on the relative performance and reproductive success of hatchery and naturally produced fish in the wild, suggesting that the abundance and productivity, and spatial structure and diversity scores be raised. There were no disagreements with the suggestion. The group also agreed that it would like more time to finish reviewing the scoring. Members agreed that the RTT will confirm the final rankings at its next meeting, which requires the members to review it between this meeting and the next. Casey suggested that members include notes to any revisions they make to scoring so that the Monitoring and Data Management Committee will have appropriate context to review all revisions.

**Next steps:** The MaDMC’s next meeting is March 28, so comments and revisions will need to be to Keely or Casey by March 26. The MaDMC will incorporate changes, update the table and bring back to the RTT on April 9.

#### 5. Project Rating Criteria Update

Casey mentioned that the assessment proposal criteria could not be finished until the data gap prioritization was completed. Kate and Joe Lange will work on project design criteria for the RTT to review at its meeting next month.

#### 6. UCSRB Update

Derek provided the group an update on the regional SRFB/Tributary funding rounds for 2008. The region established a timeline for the processes, which Casey projected on the screen. The members had several questions regarding the process that involves technical review and field tours. Derek noted that the regional kickoff meeting for the two funds is April 30 in Wenatchee. He also said that the state’s Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) will be meeting in Wenatchee the following two days, May 1-2, at the Confluence Technology Center.

Julie provided additional updates regarding UCSRB activities, including identifying short- and long-term priorities out of the Implementation Schedule, and the recent Board

member trip to Washington, D.C. She also provided an update on the USFWS process to reclassify the status of bull trout.

Ron Walter provided his perspective of the Washington DC trip. He started by saying that he was pleasantly surprised to hear how respected the Regional Technical Team is at the policy level. The importance of the grass roots approach to the technical validity of the science is significant, particularly in light of an eminent administration change.

7. Wenatchee Shiraz modeling presentation

Jon Honea from NOAA presented to the group information on the Shiraz model and results from the Wenatchee sub-basin.

Several comments were made regarding the restoration scenarios and their applicability to the implementation schedule. It was suggested that Jon and NOAA be very clear that the restoration scenarios that were modeled did not include many of the actions that are planned in the Wenatchee watershed. Jon and Michelle said that data does not exist to link those actions to biological response, so they cannot be modeled with empirical relationships.

**Next steps:** Jon will be preparing a manuscript and the RTT agreed that they would like the opportunity to review a draft.

Casey adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.